

Date: Wed, 25 May 94 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #221
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 25 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 221

Today's Topics:

Code test speeds (5 msgs)
Skinny Dip

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 24 May 1994 08:15:14 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2r0ds7\$pbh@chnews.intel.com> cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT--) writes:

>
>The guy I know with Attention Deficit Disorder has been a ham for
>30 years and holds a commercial FCC license. He has forgotten more
>about radio than I will ever know. He is barred from normal HF
>operation even though he was an AM broadcast engineer for many years.
>He has spent hundreds of hours trying to learn to copy code. Ever try
>to get a code waver for ADD?

I wanted to be a commercial airline pilot but couldn't pass the eye exam.
People just have to accept their weaknesses and go on with life.

> A Morse Code test is like having detailed
>spark-gap technical questions on the written test.

Cec - you've eaten too many of Ed's prunes. Spark's not a legal mode, but I frequently count more CW QSOs than any other mode on the HF bands. CW is being used just as much today as yesteryear. The test is relevant.

>The guy with ADD has a genius level IQ.

And I would have made an exceptional airline pilot but I couldn't get in.

>Morse code is as obsolete
>as are "slip sticks" in this day and age. (Remember slide rules?)

Not when there's as many if not more CW QSOs than any other mode at a given time.

Slide rules? I don't even allow my math students to use calculators - everything has to be done with pencil and paper.

73 Cec,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: 24 May 1994 09:01:50 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!udel!news.sprintlink.net!
rtp.vnet.net!char2.vnet.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Neil D. Friedman (ndfriedman@delphi.com) wrote:
: Jerry Dallal <jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu> writes:
:
: >(2) [I need help on this one.] I thought it was *required* by international
: >treaty. I say 'thought' because I don't know how the no-Code Tech class
: >is able to coexist along with these requirements.
:
: There is no international requirement for a code test above 30 MHz.

OK - then please explain how CB is legal?

Also - what is the international code requirement - in wpm?

Why not put pressure (votes) on the ARRL to get the requirement changed. Rightly or wrongly the ARRL is perceived to represent the ENTIRE Amateur community.

Isn't a lot of the resistance to dropping the code requirement the "Tree House Syndrome" (Now that I climbed up here - I want to pull up the ladder - or at last remove every other rung).

(quaver switch) You are going to put an elevator WHERE????
(quaver switch)

David W. Barrow III, BSBA, JD
exe02594@vnet.net
N9UNR @ WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
(414) 375-3557
or - if you must "snail it"
1894 Elm Drive - Town of Cedarburg
West Bend, WI 53095-9603

Date: 24 May 1994 08:49:16 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!udel!
news.sprintlink.net!rtp.vnet.net!char2.vnet.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin jessup (kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com) wrote:
: In <hamilton.768755278@BIX.com>
: hamilton@BIX.com (hamilton on BIX) writes:
: >I say leave things where they are. Or if there are changes to be made,
: >consider some "Extra-Extra" licenses for really high-speed code (> 30 wpm)
: >or for demonstration of special skills in handling emergency traffic, etc.

: Why does nobody want the theory tougher?? CW tests greater than the
: existing 20 WPM so as to provide a greater challenge?? Whats wrong
: with a theory challenge? Could it be that once you get to that 20 WPM
: point, the code becomes an obsession? A skill to be learned and taken
: to ridiculous extremes at the expense of all other knowledge?

: After over a year of reading rec.amateur.radio.policy the truth
: finally becomes clear: amateurs really are NOT afraid of code
: nearly as much as they are of theory. The thought of a theory
: test with more math and electronic fundamentals then the
: existing advanced and extra tests horrifies them...
: "Lord have mercy: we might have to do a little network analysis and
: solve an equation with three unknowns. OH MY GOD! We might have
: to figure the AC gain of a multistage amplifier. We might
: have to figure out the input impedance of a transistor amp!
: Nosireebob! I'd rather go on upping my code speed and get
: more HF privileges while continuing to accuse those dumb
: nocodes of being applicance operators. Yes: appliance
: operators. After all, I know how to build a kit or copy
: a design out of QST. I can copy 20 WPM. I have a WALL of
: QSL cards. I took 1st in the contest last week. I am a ham's ham!"
: Tougher theory means learning new concepts that you have never heard

: of before. It means undersanding rather than brute-force pattern
: recognition.

: BTW, why are ALL the contests related to making contacts. Why
: are there no theory contests? Why is ALL the prestige in amateur
: radio associated with code, contacts and contests?

: How about a contest that gives all participants a year to come
: up with a new design (not a reinvention of the wheel) that
: requires efficient spectrum usage, low cost and reliable
: data and/or voice transfer? Or even use an existing modulation
: technique but have a contest to do it better and cheaper than
: anything else available. How about giving it as much or more
: attention as the page after page of contesting and QSL awards
: that I see in issue after issue of QST?

: --
: /`-_ kevin.jessup@mixcom.com
: { }/ Marquette Electronics, Inc
: \ / N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio
: |__*| N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA

Kevin makes good sense. To what end do I exchange a call sign,
Contact number, and station class on Field Day? What have I
proved?

(For me it is a time when I am away from phones (except the cell-tell)
and can chat with good friends while awaiting my turn to operate a HF
rig "under supervision". We debate whether to "park and bark" or
"roam and groan" to get more contacts....)

Why not use repeaters? Link a dozen or so and pass traffic from the
Left Coast to the West Coast?

Its almost too late for this year - but why not analyze the rules,
figure out what produces the most points (12GHz maybe) and work
the "h3ck" out of that!

Since the Coast Guard has given up the code - then maybe we are
- again - lagging. We USED to be the pioneers (defined as those
with their faces in the dirt and arrows in their backs). Now it
seems that the commercial uses will "gobble up" the frequencies
before "we" get there. Maybe we need to substitute feed-horn
questions for the code.

I wish I could give proper credit for the idea which appeared here
a short time ago - which I think may be the BEST INTERIM solution
- put a few code questions into each element so that the "testee"
could at least identify which repeater he/she/it is on.

David W. Barrow III | .sig under construction
exe02594@vnet.net
N9UNR@WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
1894 Elm Drive - Town of Cedarburg
West Bend, WI 53095-9603
(414) 375-2667

Date: Tue, 24 May 94 20:35:24 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!noc.near.net!
news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

exe02594 <exe02594@char2.vnet.net> writes:

>OK - then please explain how CB is legal?

The international code requirement pertains only to amateur operation.
CB is not amateur radio.

Date: Tue, 24 May 94 11:39:19 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!
news.duke.edu!godot.cc.duq.edu!newsfeed.pitt.edu!dsinc!wells!w2up!
barry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> Although a good idea, I don't think its practical, since some health
> plans may not have a physician who is a ham. Thus someone would have to
> go to a non-provider physician and incur an out-of-pocket expense, or not
> get a waiver at all, which defeats the purpose.
>
> MD
> --
> -- Michael P. Deignan
> -- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
> -- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Uh oh - you are touching a nerve here! So there's no ham-dox in your HMO.
Big deal! If a ham license is worth anything to someone, they can fork
over a few bucks for a medical exam. Despite President and Mr. Clinton's

plans, I don't believe free health care is a god-given right. Neither is free legal care, free automotive care or free groceries.

Judging from your header, you're in Rhode Island - the state which is presently (via its BC/BS plan) trying to claim that having cataract surgery in the second eye is unnecessary - after all, we only need one eye to see...

Barry N. Kutner, W2UP Usenet/Internet: barry@w2up.wells.com
Newtown, PA Packet Radio: W2UP @ WB3JOE.#EPA.PA.USA.NA
 Packet Cluster: W2UP >K2TW (FRC)

.....

Date: 24 May 1994 04:42:36 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!usenet.ufl.edu!
usenet.cis.ufl.edu!anshar.shadow.net!anshar.shadow.net!nobody@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Skinny Dip
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

<EEEEEE< EE <EE fEE> <EEEEEE< <EEEEEE< EE EE EEEEEE< fEE> EEEEEE<
EE<<< EE<EEfl EE EE EE EE EE EE< <EE EE EE EE EE EE<<<EE
fifififlEE EEflEE< EE EE EE EE EE flEEEEfl EE EE EE EE EEflflfl
fleeeeeefl EE flEE fEE> EE EE EE EE fEE> EEEEEEfl fEE> EE

*** THIGH CREAM ***

The ORIGINAL thigh cream, as seen on national TV
This is the NEW, SUPER STRENGTH formula
Accept none of the immitation creams
YOU'RE WORTH THE BEST!!!

Now only \$29.95 per bottle which INCLUDES shipping, handling and tax
U.S. orders only, please. Rush check or money order to:

U.S. Health Inc.
18524 NW 67th Ave. #311
Miami, Florida 33015

Date: 24 May 94 17:05:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <hamilton.768755278@BIX.com>, <1994May13.195106.20824@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <2rst4c\$gej@char2.vnet.net>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

exe02594@char2.vnet.net (exe02594) writes:

>Kevin makes good sense. To what end do I exchange a call sign,
>Contact number, and station class on Field Day? What have I
>proved?

You've proven that you can pass small amounts of information quickly to a large number of geographically diverse stations. In a Real Emergency, this is what really counts.

>Since the Coast Guard has given up the code - then maybe we are
>- again - lagging.

Um, you might want to tell that to the folks at NMC, who work a couple dozen ships an hour in the CW portion of the 8 MHz maritime mobile band. No, the Coast Guard has not given up the code. [They stopped monitoring the 500 kHz calling frequency a few months back, but mediumwave traffic on all modes is spotty these days.]

>We USED to be the pioneers (defined as those with their faces in the dirt and arrows in their backs).

Yes and no. Hams largely pioneer advances in cost reduction, along with a few technological bits here and there. The latter hasn't slowed a bit.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The Enemy of the Good is the Better."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan

Date: Tue, 24 May 1994 19:40:14 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!
news.byu.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!world!dts@@.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2rm331\$i1j@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <2rmci7\$nil@sefl.satelnet.org>, <1994May22.220257.3643@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>.ed
Subject : Re: FCC understaffing problem

In article <1994May22.220257.3643@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary

Coffman) writes:

>In article <2rmci7\$nil@sefl.satelnet.org> jmodlin@satelnet.org (Jeffrey Modlin) writes:

>>As another side bar:

>>

>>Our tickets are one of the only free things that can be gotten anymore
>>through the FED. I know cost is always an issue, but don't you (pl)
>>think that a small tariff on our licenses might help solve the issue.
>>After all this person is there to meet our needs and my feeling is that
>>her salary could go to better use. Ladies and Gents, if we're ready to
>>plunk down several hundreds of dollars on equipment, shouldn't we be
>>ready to drop another \$5 or \$10 for the license? The \$5 +/- for the test
>>is fine with all so why not take the next step. The cost of processing a
>>ticket should be felt by the applicants not spread throughout the tax
>>base and paid for by the rest of the tax paying public.

>>

>>Maybe if we're covering the cost we could have more to say about the turn
>>around time.

>

>There are two things wrong with this idea. First, by law, all revenues
>go directly to the Treasury general fund. Only Congress is Constitutionally
>authorized to appropriate money. So any license fee is just a tax. Second,

Is there anything that keeps Congress from directly targeting dollars to particular accounts? They do make the laws, after all...

>there is no competition for the FCC in handling licensing, therefore there
>is no incentive for them to perform efficiently. You can't take your business
>elsewhere if you aren't satisfied with their service. Your only recourse is
>through the political process, and that's open to all citizens, not just
>those who receive services.

>

>Gary

- -

Daniel Senie Internet: dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting n1jeb@world.std.com
508-779-0439 Compuserve: 74176,1347

Date: Tue, 24 May 1994 22:52:20 GMT

From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arp
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <ddtodd.77.000D50FB@ucdavis.edu>, <hamilton.768924952@BIX.com>, <ddtodd.89.0008D30A@ucdavis.edu>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <ddtodd.89.0008D30A@ucdavis.edu> ddtodd@ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

> You keep saying that cw is just as important as it has always
>been. This is simply not true. The ARRL did a survey recently.

The survey said that almost 40% of hams operate CW (not exclusive of other modes). But trying listening to 40M in the evening and what you'll actually hear is at least 50% of all QSOs are being conducted using CW.

CW is just as important as it has always been.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Tue, 24 May 1994 22:59:30 GMT

From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2qtv2u\$pqn@chnews.intel.com>, <hamilton.768924220@BIX.com>, <051694162854Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <051694162854Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>>But obsolete? Anyone who's listened on HF knows that's not true.
>
>Yes sir, we are dedicated to preserving the history of radio!

Dan, do as the man suggested! Listen and count the CW vs other-mode QSOs.

>But MUCH more of the activity hams engage in is NOT morse code.

Wrong wrong wrong. There are just as many if not more CW QSOs being conducted as compared to any other mode at any one time. [I'm going to have everyone saying this in their sleep.]

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Tue, 24 May 1994 18:04:10 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem58.ucdavis.edu!
ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94May18134613@urth.eng.sun.com>, <2rgane\$elb@chnews.intel.com>,

<Anthony_Pelliccio-230594124631@138.16.64.55>, i
Subject : Re: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>Cecil,
> Isn't the total spectrum used for HF CW less than 2MHz worth of
>bandwidth? Not very significant when you come right down to it.

Tony,
CW is allowed on all HF frequencies. You are probably confused with the CW
exclusive frequencies.

Dan

Dan Todd ddtodd@ucdavis.edu kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na
Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy

Date: 24 May 94 18:01:34 GMT
From: agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!NewsWatcher!user@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2rgane\$elb@chnews.intel.com>,
<Anthony_Pelliccio-230594124631@138.16.64.55>, <ddtodd.114.000A121D@ucdavis.edu>
Subject : Re: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

In article <ddtodd.114.000A121D@ucdavis.edu>, ddtodd@ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.
Todd) wrote:

> Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio) writes:
>
> >Cecil,
> > Isn't the total spectrum used for HF CW less than 2MHz worth of
> >bandwidth? Not very significant when you come right down to it.
>
> Tony,
> CW is allowed on all HF frequencies. You are probably confused with the CW
> exclusive frequencies.

You're right... but even when you take total amateur spectrum below 30MHz
it's not that much. The VHF/UHF bands waste much more.

--
== Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR
== Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu, Tel. (401) 863-1880 Fax. (401) 863-2269
== The opinions above are my own and not those of my employer.

Date: Tue, 24 May 1994 08:35:57 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9405111559.AA00194@hwking.cca.rockwell.com>, <BPL8Lc3w165w@w2up.wells.com>, <SR0.94May12193553@media-lab.media.mit.edu>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <SR0.94May12193553@media-lab.media.mit.edu> sro@media.mit.edu (Shawn O'Donnell) writes:

>
>How about this: since the technology is changing, we drop or lower the
>code speed, but we require you to copy ASCII BPSK at 300 baud by ear.

I don't hear too much of that on the bands but I do hear CW being used as much if not more than any other mode.

> What's so special about the
>code?

At least half of those on HF use it.

>Just because we had to learn it doesn't mean that it's
>important.

I'm not sure if anything is 'important' in this hobby. But the code sure is useful. I can build a CW xmtr from spare parts (see my articles from last year on r.r.a.homebrew) and be on the air having a QSO with someone thousands of miles away in just a few hours time. That might no be 'important' but it sure is fun.

Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #221
